

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/524,739	Applicant(s) KLINGLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Patrick F. O'Reilly III	Art Unit 3749	

All Participants:

(1) Patrick F. O'Reilly III.

(2) Kevin L. McHenry, Attorney for Applicants.

Date of Interview: 25 September 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
30, 57, 59, and 60.

Prior art documents discussed:
Danieau (US 5,906,355); Stevenson et al. (US 6,802,768).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Steven B. McAllister/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3749
 /Patrick F. O'Reilly III/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3749

Status of Application: Allowable

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3:00 pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner discussed minor substantive changes in independent claims 30 and 57 with the applicants' attorney so as to more clearly define the claimed invention over the prior art, especially the Danieau and Stevenson et al. references. In addition, the examiner and the applicants' attorney also discussed adding two new dependent claims that describe the manner in which the roller-type louver contacts the drive shaft and/or return shaft. After consulting with his client, the applicants' attorney agreed to all of the changes proposed by the examiner to place the claims in a condition for allowance. The specific changes are documented in the attached Examiner's Amendment.